

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 WES WALTERS,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.
12 ICICLE SEAFOODS, INC., et al.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C03-545JLR

14 ORDER

15 WES WALTERS,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.
18 PHOENIX PROCESSOR LIMITED
19 PARTNERSHIP, et al.,

20 Defendants.

CASE NO. C04-303JLR

21
22 This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff's motion to stay enforcement of
23 the default judgment entered against him while on appeal (Dkt. # 160). To obtain a stay
24 of proceedings to enforce a monetary judgment, an appellant must provide a supersedeas
25 bond in the full amount "to secure the appellees from a loss resulting from the stay of
26 execution." Rachel v. Banana Republic, Inc., 831 F.2d 1503, 1505 n. 1 (9th Cir. 1987);
27 Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(d). Plaintiff argues that the court should stay enforcement without
28

ORDER – 1

1 requiring a supersedeas bond because of his impecunious status and Defendant Phoenix
2 Processor Limited Partnership's ("Phoenix") admitted "tentative chance of collecting."
3 While the court recognizes that at least one court outside this circuit¹ has suggested that
4 the supersedeas bond requirement may be waived when requiring a party with limited
5 financial means to post a bond would place other creditors at risk, the court finds that
6 situation lacking here where the amount owed by Plaintiff (\$1,974) is a mere fraction of
7 the \$47,000 allegedly owed by him in unpaid child support. Plaintiff's creditors are
8 already insecure, regardless of whether he posts a bond in the judgment amount. Thus,
9 the court DENIES Plaintiff's motion to stay without a supersedeas bond.

10
11 Dated this 7th day of June, 2005.
12



13
14 JAMES L. ROBART
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 ¹Plaintiff relies on Dillon v. City of Chicago, 866 F.2d 902, 904-05 (7th Cir. 1988) (listing five factors for court to consider in determining whether to waive bond requirement).